



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,331	10/12/1999	SHAUN S. AMINI	EYEC-001/00U	6010
26389	7590	09/01/2005	EXAMINER	
CHRISTENSEN, O'CONNOR, JOHNSON, KINDNESS, PLLC 1420 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 2800 SEATTLE, WA 98101-2347				AN, SHAWN S
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2613				

DATE MAILED: 09/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/416,331	AMINI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Shawn S. An	2613	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### **Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                   2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### **Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 59-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 59-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### **Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### **Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/21/05.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. As per Applicant's instructions as filed on 3/21/05, claims 1-58 have been canceled, and claims 59-101 have been newly added.

### ***Response to Remarks/Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to newly added claims 59-101 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 59-70, 75-82, and 84-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough et al (6,226,031 B1).

**Regarding claims 59, 75, and 86,** Barraclough et al discloses a video surveillance and monitoring system, comprising:

a private network (Fig. 2; between 230 and 220) for enabling communication with surveillance cameras, wherein at least two cameras (240, 242) correspond to geographically distinct monitored sites (col. 7, lines 46-53);

a plurality of video monitoring devices (240, 242), each device generating video monitoring data, wherein the video monitoring devices generate video data and receives control instructions corresponding to a position of the monitoring device, wherein at least two monitoring devices correspond to distinct monitored sites (col. 8, lines 37-65);

a centralized off-site control site (230) including at least one server being coupled to the private network (Fig. 2; between 230 and 220) and to a public network (Fig. 2; between 226 and 230), the server being operative to initialize communication between the surveillance cameras and at least one off-site client workstation (214) coupled to the public network, to coordinate the retrieval of video images from the cameras to produce retrieved video images to the at least one client workstation (214a), and to enable off-site client workstations to effect communication with selected surveillance cameras, wherein the client workstation cannot initialize communication with the surveillance cameras (col. 6, lines 49-67; col. 5, lines 52-67).

Furthermore, Barraclough et al discloses off-site image database (246) archiving the retrieved video images, and sending live video images to a remote unit (client workstation) for display (col. 8, lines 59-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art employing a video surveillance and monitoring system as taught by Barraclough et al to easily re-locate the off-site image database to be included in the centralized off-site control site so as to save recorded image data sets to an already considered safe control site, and to send live video images to the off-site client workstation for display.

**Regarding claims 60, 76, and 87,** Barraclough et al discloses virtual private network (col. 6, lines 49-52).

**Regarding claims 61, 77, and 88,** Barraclough et al discloses a camera server being coupled to one or more surveillance cameras (monitoring devices) (col. 1, lines 39-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for the camera server being coupled to the private network to facilitate communications with the centralized control site.

**Regarding claims 62, 78, and 89,** Barraclough et al discloses an NTSC decoder (col. 4, lines 1-6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art to realize the cameras producing composite NTSC video signals, wherein the camera server being operable to capture NTSC video signals and convert the captured NTSC video signals.

**Regarding claims 63, 79, and 90,** Barraclough et al discloses means for processing multitude of world-wide-web data links (col. 13, lines 33-36), and an internet (web) server (col. 6, lines 53-56).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art to realize surveillance cameras comprising a self-contained web server and network camera for monitoring a surveillance area.

**Regarding claims 64 and 91,** Barraclough et al discloses public Internet network (col. 6, lines 49-61).

**Regarding claims 65, 80, and 92,** Barraclough et al discloses sending live images to a remote unit for display (col. 8, lines 59-65).

Furthermore, the Examiner takes official notice that it is conventionally well known for an image server to repeatedly store live video image data to a file or a temporally file that is retrievable by a client workstation.

**Regarding claims 66 and 93,** it is considered a simple design modification to change Barraclough et al's video data to a temp file, which is well known in the art, and obviously rename the temp file to the file that is retrievable by the client workstation, if an user deemed it necessary.

**Regarding claims 67-69, 81-82, 84-85, and 94-96,** Barraclough et al discloses receiving and processing a camera command control code for identifying a movement such as pan, tilt, zoom control (col. 8, lines 37-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for the sever being operable to receive and process a camera command control which identifies a user's desired type of camera adjustment such as an absolute pan-tilt-zoom control and/or a relative pan-tilt-zoom control, and/or the control site generating control code instructing at least one of the plurality of monitoring devices to move to a series of predefined positions.

**Regarding claims 70 and 97,** the Examiner takes official notice that Internet Protocol is a communication standard conventionally well known in the art.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art to recognize the sever being operable to receive and process an encoded Internet Protocol address of a camera server for an identification purpose.

5. Claims 71-74, 83, and 98-101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barraclough et al (6,226,031 B1) in view of Pshtissky (4,714,959).

**Regarding claims 71-74, 83, and 98-101,** Barraclough et al does not particularly disclose converting a received camera control code to a binary-coded command and to forward the binary coded command string to an identified surveillance camera (monitoring device).

However, Pshtissky teaches that the camera control signals can be encoded in such manners as binary, BCD, or a simple arithmetic counting of the pulses (col. 2, lines 13-22).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art employing a video surveillance and monitoring system as taught by Barraclough et al to incorporate Pshtissky's teaching as above so that the server is operable to convert a received camera control code to a binary-coded command and to forward the binary-coded command string to the camera (web) server, which in turn forwards the binary-coded command string to a surveillance (network) camera, and/or to forward the binary-coded command string to a separately-addressable device that is solely responsible for

receiving camera control commands as a most efficient way to convert a received camera control code to a binary-coded command, thereby significantly saving bandwidth associated with the sending/transmitting a plurality of command data.

***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.
7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to *Shawn S An* whose telephone number is 571-272-7324.
8. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

9. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Please note the new fax number.



SHAWN AN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

8/31/05